

The Power of LOCCq State Transformations

Ashish V. Thapliyal*

Department of Computer Science
University of California at Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720.

John A. Smolin

IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598.[†]

(Dated: February 1, 2008)

Reversible state transformations under entanglement non-increasing operations give rise to entanglement measures. It is well known that asymptotic local operations and classical communication (LOCC) are required to get a simple operational measure of bipartite pure state entanglement. For bipartite mixed states and multipartite pure states it is likely that a more powerful class of operations will be needed. To this end [1] have defined more powerful versions of state transformations (or reducibilities), namely LOCCq (asymptotic LOCC with a sublinear amount of quantum communication) and CLOCC (asymptotic LOCC with catalysis). In this paper we show that *LOCCq state transformations are only as powerful as asymptotic LOCC state transformations* for multipartite pure states. We first generalize the concept of entanglement gambling from two parties to multiple parties: any pure multipartite entangled state can be transformed to an EPR pair shared by some pair of parties and that any irreducible m ($m \geq 2$) party pure state can be used to create any other state (pure or mixed), using only local operations and classical communication (LOCC). We then use this tool to prove the result. We mention some applications of multipartite entanglement gambling to multipartite distillability and to characterizations of multipartite minimal entanglement generating sets. Finally we discuss generalizations of this result to mixed states by defining the class of *cat distillable states*.

PACS numbers: Valid PACS appear here

I. INTRODUCTION

Entanglement is a fundamental aspect of quantum mechanics. It has been found useful for various information processing tasks such as teleportation[2], superdense coding[3], entanglement assisted classical and quantum communication[4, 5], quantum algorithms[6], and quantum cryptography[7]. Since it is such an important resource, much effort has been put into quantifying it. Entanglement for two-party pure states is completely understood. For mixed states the situation is not as clear, there being various different measures. Recently, [1] have proposed a program to quantify multipartite entanglement using the idea of reversible state transformations induced by entanglement non-increasing operations. It is well known that asymptotic local operations and classical communication (LOCC) are required to get a simple operational measure of bipartite pure state entanglement. For bipartite mixed states and multipartite pure states it is likely that a more powerful class of operations will be needed. To this end [1] have defined more powerful versions of state transformations (or reducibilities), namely LOCCq (asymptotic LOCC with a sub-

linear amount of quantum communication) and CLOCC (asymptotic LOCC with catalysis). In this paper we show that *LOCCq state transformations are only as powerful as asymptotic LOCC state transformations* for multipartite pure states. We first generalize the concept of entanglement gambling from two parties to multiple parties: any pure multipartite entangled state can be transformed to an EPR pair shared by some pair of parties and that any non-trivial m ($m \geq 2$) party pure state can be used to create any other state (pure or mixed), using only local operations and classical communication (LOCC). We then use this tool to prove the result. We mention some applications of multipartite entanglement gambling to multipartite distillability and to characterizations of multipartite minimal entanglement generating sets. Finally we discuss generalizations of this result to mixed states by defining the class of *cat distillable states*.

II. MULTIPARTITE ENTANGLEMENT GAMBLING

We begin by looking at entanglement gambling for bipartite pure states. Bennett, Bernstein, Popescu and Schumacher introduced the idea of entanglement gambling in [8]. The idea is to produce an EPR pair with a positive probability using local operations and classical communication (LOCC) starting from any other entangled bipartite pure state. We briefly review the bipartite

*Also at Mathematical Sciences Research Institute, Berkeley, CA;
Electronic address: ash@msri.org, thaps@cs.berkeley.edu

[†]Electronic address: smolin@watson.ibm.com

entanglement portocol. Let us consider an arbitrary entangled pure state Ψ shared by A and B. It is well known that for a bipartite pure state can always be written in a Schmidt decomposition

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i |i^A i^B\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where $k \geq 2$ since the state is entangled, $\{a_i > 0 | i = 1, \dots, n\}$, $|i^A\rangle$ form an orthonormal basis for A and $|i^B\rangle$ form an orthonormal basis for B. Now A and B can apply the local projectors $P^{A/B} = |0^{A/B}\rangle\langle 0^{A/B}| + |1^{A/B}\rangle\langle 1^{A/B}|$ on their halves of the state. This produces state

$$\psi_1 = c|00\rangle + d|11\rangle$$

with probability $p = a_1^2 + a_2^2$, where

$$c = \frac{a_1}{p} \text{ and } d = \frac{a_2}{p}.$$

Then Alice applies the local quantum operation given by the superoperator with operator elements

$$A_1 = d|0\rangle\langle 0| + c|1\rangle\langle 1| \\ A_2 = \sqrt{1-d^2}|0\rangle\langle 0| + \sqrt{1-c^2}|1\rangle\langle 1|,$$

then the outcome corresponding to A_1 gives an EPR pair with probability $2c^2d^2$. Thus the total success probability for the whole process is $(2a_1^2a_2^2)/(a_1^2 + a_2^2)$ which is non-zero. Thus any pure bipartite entangled state can be converted to an EPR pair with a positive probability.

Let us now write the above result in the notation used by [1]¹. First we briefly review the notation. We start with state transformations for one copy of a state involving probabilistic outcomes, where the procedure for the reducibility may fail some of time. This is called stochastic state transformation.

We say a state Ψ is *stochastic LOCC transformable* to Φ with yield p , written as $\Psi \rightarrow_{\text{LOCC}} \Phi^{\otimes p}$ if and only if

$$\exists \mathcal{L} \quad \Phi = \frac{\mathcal{L}(\Psi)}{\text{tr} \mathcal{L}(\Psi)}, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{L}$ is a multilocally implementable superoperator² such that $\text{tr} \mathcal{L}(\Psi) = p$. This means that a copy of Φ may be obtained from a copy of Ψ with probability p by LOCC operations. When $p = 1$ it is called an exact transformation or an exact reducibility.

Let $\mathcal{E}_2$ denote the set of bipartite pure entangled states, then the bipartite entanglement gambling result can be expressed as

$$\forall \psi \in \mathcal{E}_2, \quad \exists p > 0, \quad \psi \rightarrow \text{EPR}^{\otimes p}. \quad (3)$$

Clearly a generalized version of stochastic transformations is obtained if we allow a finite number of copies of the source and target states. We say state Ψ is *multicopy stochastic LOCC transformable* to state Φ with yield p , written as $\Psi \rightarrow_{\text{LOCC}} \Phi^{\otimes p}$, if and only if

$$\exists \mathcal{L}, m, n \quad \Phi^{\otimes n} = \frac{\mathcal{L}(\Psi^{\otimes m})}{\text{tr} \mathcal{L}(\Psi^{\otimes m})}, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{L}$ is a multilocally implementable superoperator such that $\text{tr} \mathcal{L}(\Psi) = pm/n$. This means that n copies of Φ may be obtained from m copies of Ψ with yield p per copy by LOCC operations.

Let us return to bipartite entanglement gambling again. It gives us an EPR pair with positive probability starting from any entangled pure state. Since EPR pairs can be used in a teleportation protocol to create an arbitrary bipartite state, clearly any bipartite pure entangled state may be converted to any other bipartite state with a positive probability. Notice that this protocol will in general require multiple copies of the source state since the target state may be a state with higher Schmidt number. Thus a stronger version of bipartite gambling can be written using the multicopy stochastic reducibility as

$$\forall \psi \in \mathcal{E}_2, \quad \exists p > 0, \quad \psi \rightarrow \phi^{\otimes p}, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_2$ denotes the set of bipartite pure entangled states and ϕ is any bipartite state, pure or mixed, in finite dimensions.

Now let us consider the multi-party scenario: There are m parties ($m \geq 2$) labelled as $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. Given a non-trivial subset X of the parties and its complement $\bar{X}$, we say that $\{X, \bar{X}\}$ defines a *cut* between X and $\bar{X}$. We say that pure state Ψ is *factorizable* across the cut $\{X, \bar{X}\}$ of the parties if Ψ can be written as a tensor product of two states, one with the parties in set X and the other with the parties in the complement $\bar{X}$. We say that a state is *entangled* if it is not factorizable across some cut. We define a pure state to be *irreducible* if it is not factorizable across all cuts. Thus an irreducible m -party pure state captures the notion of a true m -party state. Now we are ready to generalize entanglement gambling.

It turns out that for multiple parties, gambling can be generalized in different ways. First we generalize the weaker result shown in equation 3. In this case we show that an entangled pure multipartite state can be transformed under LOCC to an EPR pair between some pair of parties. We write this as a lemma³.

¹ In [1] state transformations are also called as reducibilities: If ψ is transformed to ϕ we can say that the problem of creating ϕ is reducible to the problem of creating ψ . This provides the intuition behind the name reducibility. In this paper we will use the state transformations language instead of reducibilities.

² A multilocally implementable superoperator is just a mathematical representation of a LOCC protocol.

³ This lemma was independently proved in [9]

Lemma 1 : If state Ψ is an m -partite pure state that is entangled across the cut $\{\{i_1\}, \{i_2, i_3, \dots, i_m\}\}$ then there exists $p > 0$ and two parties say P_1 and P_2 such that,

$$\Psi \rightarrow (\text{EPR}^{P_1 P_2})^{\otimes p} . \quad (6)$$

Proof: We argue by induction on the number of parties m . The first non-trivial case is when $m = 2$. Here entanglement gambling protocols [8] we discussed in the introduction guarantee the result. So let us assume that the result is true for $m < k$. We need to prove that it is true for $m = k > 2$. For this we will use the idea of entanglement of assistance [10]. We let $A = i_1$ be the helper and $B = i_2$ be the first party and $\{i_3, i_4, \dots, i_m\} = C$ be the (composite) second party. Consider the entanglement of assistance of ρ^{BC} . If it is zero then from the result on zero entanglement of assistance from [10] implies that either $\rho^{\text{BC}} = \rho^{\text{B}} \otimes |\psi^{\text{C}}\rangle\langle\psi^{\text{C}}|$ or $\rho^{\text{BC}} = |\psi^{\text{B}}\rangle\langle\psi^{\text{B}}| \otimes \rho^{\text{C}}$. Then either $\Psi = \psi^{\text{AB}} \otimes \psi^{\text{C}}$ or $\Psi = \psi^{\text{AC}} \otimes \psi^{\text{B}}$. In the first case, since Ψ was entangled across the partition $\{\{i_1\}, \{i_2, i_3, \dots, i_m\}\}$, ψ^{i_1, i_2} has to be entangled, in which case we apply the $m = 2$ case to get an EPR pair between i_1 and i_2 . Similarly for the second case $\psi^{i_1, i_3, \dots, i_m}$ must be entangled across the cut $\{\{i_1\}, \{i_3, \dots, i_m\}\}$, this by the induction hypothesis can give an EPR pair between some two parties. If the entanglement of assistance is not zero, then A can help B and C to get (with finite probability) an entangled state ψ^{BC} i.e. state $\psi^{i_2, i_3, \dots, i_m}$ that is entangled across the partition $\{\{i_2\}, \{i_3, \dots, i_m\}\}$. This by the induction hypothesis can give an EPR pair between some two parties. Thus the result is proved.

Note that the result does not require multiple copies of the starting state. Note that for proving the above result we used the necessary and sufficient condition for a state to have zero entanglement of assistance. It is quite reasonable that the entanglement of assistance would be useful for a multipartite scenario, since the motivation for it relies on a three party scenario.

Now we generalize the stronger version of bipartite entanglement gambling shown in Eq. 4. The generalization involves showing that any irreducible m -party state can generate any other m -party state (pure or mixed) with positive probability using the multicopy stochastic LOCC operations. We prove this by showing that we can get an EPR pair between every pair of parties from any irreducible m -partite pure state. Then using teleportation, any other state can be generated from these EPR pairs. We state this result below.

Theorem 1 *If state Ψ is an irreducible m -partite state then for any two parties say P_2 and P_1 there exists $p > 0$ such that,*

$$\Psi \rightarrow_{\text{LOCC}} (\text{EPR}^{P_1 P_2})^{\otimes p} . \quad (7)$$

Proof: To prove this we argue by induction on the number of parties m . The first non-trivial case is when $m = 2$. Since the state is irreducible, it is an entangled bipartite state and we get the result directly from lemma 1. Assuming the result to be true for $m < k$, we show that it

is true for $m = k$. Since Ψ is irreducible, by lemma 1 we can stochastically get an EPR pair between some two parties say A and B . If these two are the required parties P_1 and P_2 then we are done. Otherwise by teleportation through these EPR pairs, the parties A and B can implement any operation they could if they were in the same lab. Thus we can look on them as forming a composite party say $\tilde{A}$. Then we have reduced the problem to the $m = k - 1$ partite case thus proving the result.

III. THE POWER OF A LITTLE QUANTUM COMMUNICATION

In this section we will prove the main result — For pure states asymptotic LOCCq transformations are only as powerful as asymptotic LOCC state transformations. First we need to define these notions of state transformations.

State Ψ is said to be *asymptotically LOCC transformable* state Φ , written as $\Psi \rightsquigarrow_{\text{LOCC}} \Phi$, if and only if

$$\forall_{\delta > 0, \epsilon > 0} \exists_{n, n', \mathcal{L}} |(n/n') - 1| < \delta \text{ and } F(\mathcal{L}(\Psi^{\otimes n'}), \Phi^{\otimes n}) \geq 1 - \epsilon \quad . \quad (8)$$

Here $\mathcal{L}$ is a multi-locally implementable superoperator that converts n' copies of Ψ into a high fidelity approximation to n copies of Φ . Thus asymptotic reducibility captures the possibility of state transformations as the number of source and target copies tends to infinity. Also note that if $\psi \rightarrow \phi^{\otimes p}$ then $\psi \rightsquigarrow \phi^{\otimes p}$ because of the properties of a binomial distribution with probability p of success.

Asymptotic reducibilities can have non-integer yields. This can be expressed using tensor exponents that take on any nonnegative real value, so that $\Psi^{\otimes y} \rightsquigarrow \Phi^{\otimes x}$ denotes

$$\forall_{\delta > 0} \exists_{n, n'} |(n/n') - x/y| < \delta \text{ and } F(\mathcal{L}(\Psi^{\otimes n'}), \Phi^{\otimes n}) \geq 1 - \epsilon \quad . \quad (9)$$

In this case we say x/y is the asymptotic efficiency or yield with which Φ can be obtained from Ψ . This justifies the notation used while writing the stochastic state transformations.

A stronger version of asymptotic LOCC state transformation is obtained if we allow a sublinear amount of quantum communication during the transformation process. This is called (asymptotic LOCCq) state transformation. We say state Ψ is *asymptotically LOCCq transformable* to state Φ , written as $\Psi \rightsquigarrow_{\text{LOCCq}} \Phi$ if and only if

$$\forall_{\delta > 0, \epsilon > 0} \exists_{n, k, \mathcal{L}} (k/n) < \delta \text{ and } F(\mathcal{L}(\Gamma^{\otimes k} \otimes \Psi^{\otimes n}), \Phi^{\otimes n}) \geq 1 - \epsilon \quad , \quad (10)$$

where Γ denotes the m -Cat state $|0^{\otimes m}\rangle + |1^{\otimes m}\rangle$. The m -Cat states used here are a convenient way of allowing a sublinear amount $o(n)$ of quantum communication, since they can be used as described in [1] to generate EPR pairs between any two parties which in turn can be used to teleport quantum data between the parties. The $o(n)$ quantum communication allows the definition to be simpler in one respect: a single tensor power n can be used for the input state Ψ and output state Φ , rather than the separate powers n and n' used in the definition of ordinary asymptotic LOCC reducibility without quantum communication, because any $o(n)$ shortfall in number of copies of the output state can be made up by using the Cat states to synthesize the extra output states de novo. This definition is more natural than that for ordinary asymptotic LOCC reducibility in that the input and output states are allowed to differ in any way that can be repaired by an $o(n)$ expenditure of quantum communication, rather than only in the specific way of being n versus n' copies of the desired state where $n - n'$ is $o(n)$.

Clearly $\rightsquigarrow_{\text{LOCC}}$ implies $\rightsquigarrow_{\text{LOCCq}}$ because as discussed above asymptotic LOCC state transformation is a special case of LOCCq state transformations. An important question is whether LOCCq state transformations are stronger. It turns out that LOCCq state transformations are not stronger than asymptotic LOCC for pure states. This constitutes the main result of the paper.

We start by showing that a state that is factorizable across some cut can give rise to only states that are factorizable across that cut under asymptotic LOCCq state transformations. We prove this in the following lemma.

Lemma 2 : Given state Ψ that is factorizable across the partition $\{X, \bar{X}\}$ and that $\Psi \rightsquigarrow_{\text{LOCCq}} \Phi$, then Φ must be factorizable across the same partition.

Proof: This is essentially a two party problem, with X and $\bar{X}$ as the two compound parties. We argue by contradiction. Suppose Φ was non-factorizable across the partition $\{X, \bar{X}\}$ with bipartite entanglement $x > 0$. Then n copies of Φ would have nx bipartite entanglement across the partition. However, since Ψ has no entanglement across the partition and since LOCCq protocols only allow a sub linear amount of m -Cat states along with LOCC, they cannot increase the entanglement across the partition by more than $o(n)$. Thus, no asymptotic LOCCq protocol can give rise to Φ starting from Ψ .

Now we prove that for irreducible pure states, asymptotic LOCCq and asymptotic LOCC are equally powerful.

Lemma 3 For an irreducible m -partite pure state Ψ and any arbitrary state Φ ,

$$\Psi \rightsquigarrow_{\text{LOCCq}} \Phi \Leftrightarrow \Psi \rightsquigarrow_{\text{LOCC}} \Phi . \quad (11)$$

Proof Since Ψ is irreducible, it is cat distillable from theorem 1. Hence we can use a $o(n)$ copies of Ψ to generate

$o(n)$ copies of m Cat by LOCC, which we can use for the $o(n)$ quantum communication required for LOCCq. Since only $o(n)$ extra copies of Ψ are required than the LOCCq protocol, this does not change the yield asymptotically, and hence the LOCCq protocol can be simulated by an LOCC protocol. This proves the result.

Now we are ready to combine the results from the above lemmas to prove the general result as the theorem below.

Theorem 2 For m -partite pure states Ψ and Φ ,

$$\Psi \rightsquigarrow_{\text{LOCCq}} \Phi \Leftrightarrow \Psi \rightsquigarrow_{\text{LOCC}} \Phi . \quad (12)$$

Proof We argue by induction on the number of parties m . Consider the first non-trivial case $m = 2$. If Ψ is irreducible, then theorem 1 along with lemma 3 gives us the result. If Ψ is factorizable, in this case a product state, then by lemma 2 Φ must be a product state too and thus can be created trivially by LOCC operations. Now let the theorem be true for all $m < k$, then we show that it is true for $m = k$. If Ψ is irreducible, then theorem 1 along with lemma 3 gives us the result. Otherwise Ψ is factorizable across some cut $\{X, \bar{X}\}$. Then lemma 2 implies that Φ is factorizable across the same cut i.e., $\Phi = \phi_1^X \otimes \phi_2^{\bar{X}}$. Applying this theorem for $m < k$, to the states ϕ_1^X and $\phi_2^{\bar{X}}$ we have the result.

Thus we have shown that LOCC and LOCCq are equivalent for pure states.

Let us now turn our attention to an application of entanglement gambling to multipartite distillability.

IV. ENTANGLEMENT GAMBLING AND MULTIPARTITE DISTILLABILITY

In this section we will study some implications of the entanglement gambling result to the notion of distillability in multi-party systems.

One of the main problems with defining distillable entanglement for multiple parties is that since there are many different kinds of entanglement, it is impossible to maximize over the yield of all those states. However, we may easily generalize the notion of distillability from the bipartite scenario to get the following general definition of distillability: We say ρ is distillable if and only if $\rho \rightsquigarrow \Psi^{\otimes x}$ for some positive x , where ψ is some entangled pure state.

However, operationally it is more useful to have EPR pairs or Cat-states as the target state to be produced in the distillation procedure, since they can then directly be used to achieve other information processing tasks. Thus, one may define EPR distillability as: We say ρ is distillable if and only if $\rho \rightsquigarrow \Psi^{\otimes x}$ for some positive x , where Ψ is an EPR pair between some pair of parties. Similarly, one may define Cat distillability as EPR distillability, except the target state Ψ is now required to be a m -Cat state.

The relation between general distillability and EPR/Cat distillability is an interesting issue. In the bipartite case since any pure entangled state can be converted to an EPR pair, it turns out that EPR-distillability and distillability are identical. Clearly we would want this property to be true for multipartite states also. Clearly all we need to show is that any entangled multipartite pure state can give some EPR pair asymptotically, since then the entangled pure state Ψ in the general definition distillability above, can be converted to an EPR pair. This is precisely the result of lemma 1! Thus we can say that *A m -partite state ρ is distillable if and only if it is EPR distillable.*

Clearly, if a state is Cat-distillable it is also distillable and EPR distillable. Clearly, the converse is not true in general. Cat-distillable states are interesting because they can generate all other states and hence form a minimal entanglement generating set (MEGS), that is a minimal set of states that can generate any other state under asymptotic LOCC. Since the reversibility of the state transformations is not required, this is a very coarse grained entanglement measure. Let us consider a state that is factorizable across some cut of parties $\{X, \bar{X}\}$. Then it cannot be cat-distillable because that would imply that a separable bipartite state can be made into an entangled one with LOCC operations, which we know is impossible. Thus only irreducible states can be cat-distillable. Then lemma 1 shows that any irreducible pure state is cat-distillable. Putting these together we see that *a pure state is cat-distillable if and only if it is irreducible.* But dropping the requirement of reversibility still gives a qualitative broad picture of multipartite entanglement. This is analogous to classifying bipartite mixed states as distillable and undistillable to get a coarse grained measure of distillable entanglement. In this light, the result is very satisfying because it says that: If we allow ourselves to waste entanglement during transformation of states, then any irreducible state is equivalent to any other, and is more powerful entanglement-wise than any factorizable state, thus giving a hierarchy of qualitatively different entangled states which factorize into irreducible parts of various sizes.

A natural question is whether a non-factorizable mixed state is also cat-distillable. This obviously is false, because that would imply separable but non-factorizable bipartite states could generate entanglement, which we know cannot happen. So we need to generalize the idea of irreducibility to mixed states. The natural way to do this is by replacing the idea of factorizability to that of separability. So we say that Ψ is reducible across a partition $\{X, \bar{X}\}$ of parties if it is separable across that partition. We say a state is irreducible if it is not separable

across any partition of the parties. This generalization is not useful because of the existence of bound entangled states, that is states which are inseparable but not distillable. So, we could generalize irreducibility to mixed states using distillability across cuts: We say a state is irreducible if it is distillable across all cuts. Given this generalization of the definition, it is an open question whether cat-distillability and irreducibility are equivalent for mixed states, because lemma 1 does not hold for mixed states in general [11, 12]. This just means that our approach from theorem 1 won't carry over to mixed states.

V. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have shown that asymptotic LOCC and LOCCq state transformations are equally powerful for pure states. Clearly an important question is whether LOCCq is more powerful than asymptotic LOCC for mixed states. Obviously, for cat-distillable (mixed) states our result showing that the two have equal power should hold since we can use $o(n)$ Cat-states to achieve $o(n)$ quantum communication. Thus, the open question is mainly regarding the mixed states that are not cat-distillable. This is an important future direction. One possible way to get the full mixed state result just as we did for pure states, using induction and showing that factorizable states can only give rise to factorizable states under LOCCq transformations, leads to the problem of how to define irreducible mixed states such that they are cat-distillable and at the same time would facilitate an inductive argument.

We have shown here that any irreducible (non-factorizable) pure state is cat-distillable, however our protocols are not very efficient, and that was not the goal either. However, in reality, we need cat-distillable protocols that are efficient. Finding such protocols is another important future direction.

Acknowledgments

AVT acknowledges support from Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) and the Air Force Laboratory, Air Force Material Command, USAF, under Contract No. F30602-01-2-0524, also from the USA Army Research Office, under grants DAAG-55-98-C-0041, and DAAG-55-98-1-0366, and support from IBM Research. JAS acknowledges support from the USA Army Research Office, under grant DAAG-55-98-C-0041.

-
- [1] C. H. Bennett, S. Popescu, D. Rohrlich, J. A. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 012307 (2001).
 - [2] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa,

- A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [3] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**,

- 2881 (1992).
- [4] C. H. Bennett, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3081 (1999).
 - [5] C. H. Bennett, P. Shor, J.A.Smolin, and A.V.Thapliyal, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **48(10)**, 2637 (2002).
 - [6] P. W. Shor, in *Proc. 35nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, edited by S. Goldwasser (IEEE Computer Society Press, 1994), pp. 124–134.
 - [7] C. Bennett and G. Brassard, in *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computers Systems and Signal Processing, Bangalore India* (December 1984), pp. 175–179.
 - [8] C. H. Bennett, H. J. Bernstein, S. Popescu, and B. Schumacher, Phys. Rev. A **53**, 2046 (1996).
 - [9] W. Dür, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 230402 (2001).
 - [10] D. P. DiVincenzo, C. A. Fuchs, J. A. Smolin, A. Thapliyal, and A. Uhlmann, in *Proceedings of the First NASA International Conference on Quantum Computing and Quantum Communications, 17-20th February 1998, Palm Springs, CA*, edited by C. P. Williams (Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, Germany, 1999), vol. 1509 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*.
 - [11] J. A. Smolin, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 032306 (2001).
 - [12] P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal, submitted to Phys. Rev. Lett. (????).